THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (DR. AKHILESH PRASAD SINGH): (a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c) Does not arise.

Diversion of foodgrains

567. SHRI RAMDAS AGARWAL:
SHRI RAJ KUMAR DHOOT:
SHRI RAJ MOHINDER SINGH MAJITHA:
DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI:

Will the Minister of CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that PDS grains worth Rs. 31,500 crores were stolen during the last three years and poor are being cheated by diverting 53 per cent of wheat and 39 per cent of rice meant for them;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof, State-wise, cost-wise, year-wise indicating loss suffered by Exchequer;

(c) whether his Ministry has enquired into this matter, and if not, what are the reasons therefor;

(d) whether vigilance committees have, so far, been set up in all States to check pilferage/diversion of PDS grains in the country, if so, the details thereof;

(e) the action taken against the culprits; and

(f) the steps taken to prevent recurrence of such fraudulent acts?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (DR. AKHILESH PRASAD SINGH): (a) to (c) No, Sir. The Department of Food and Public Distribution got TPDS evaluated by ORG MARG. This evaluation covered the period of 2003-04 and 2004-05. The report received in 2005 mentioned that 39% of rice and 53% of wheat was being diverted.

This diversion was because of inclusion errors, leakages through ghost ration cards and pilferage during transportation and from Fair Price Shops. State-wise details of diversion reported by the evaluation study of ORG MARG are enclosed as Statement-I (*See* below).

These figures of diversion reported by the study were contested by most of the State Governments. Also diversion of rice and wheat from BPL to APL family does not meant loss of the foodgrains. It results in delivery of foodgrains to unintended category of beneficiaries. Therefore, estimation of exact loss could not be made After this study, State and UT Governments have taken a number of steps to check leakages and diversions. Therefore, it cannot be presumed that the same level of diversion has continued in subsequent years.

After receipt of this report, a nine-point action plan was evolved in consultation with State and UT Governments. This Action Plan is under implementation since July, 2006. A copy of this Plan is enclosed as Statement-II (*See* below).

(d) Status of Vigilance Committees set up in different States is enclosed as Statement-III (*See* below).

(e) and (f) To prevent recurrence of malpractices under TPDS, implementation of the nine-point action plan is being monitored by the Department of Food & Public Distribution. A revised Citizens' Charter has been circulated to State and UT Governments in July 2007 incorporating provisions of Right to Information Act, 2005 for public scrutiny of functioning of the TPDS.

Statement-I

State-wise Details of Diversion reported by Evaluation Study of ORG MARG

The diversion of both wheat and rice in consolidated from are shown in the table below:

Table 10.3: Diversion figures for wheat and rice

States	Diversion(%)	
	Rice	Wheat
1	2	3
Andaman & Nicobar Island	Neg	Neg
Andhra Pradesh	Neg	NC
Arunachal Pradesh	64.1	96.2
Assam	37.2	100.0
Bihar	14.7	44.7
Chandigarh	NC	NC
Chhattisgarh	33.4	71.4
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	48.5	69.4
Daman & Diu	NC	NC
Delhi	10.5	25.1
Goa	42.9	NC
Gujarat	16.2	24.4
Haryana	NC	74.2
Himachal Pradesh	58.2	34.1
Jammu and Kashmir	64.3	13.5
Jharkhand	Neg	37.5
Karnataka	Neg	Neg
Kerala	Neg	42.6
Lakshadweep	Neg	NC
Madhya Pradesh	48.3	44.7
Maharashtra	Neg	25.6
Manipur	97.7	100.0
Meghalaya	61.3	100.0

1	2	3
Mizoram	52.6	100.0
Nagaland	88.6	100.0
Orissa	Neg	NC
Pondicherry	Neg	NC
Punjab	NC	Neg.
Rajasthan	NC	59.0
Sikkim	Neg	100.0
Tamil Nadu	Neg	NC
Tripura	3.8	NC
Uttar Pradesh	32.4	59.1
Uttaranchal	53.3	58.0
West Bengal	34.9	86.6
All India	39.0	53.3

Statement-II

Action Plan for Strengthening of TPDS

(i) Continuous review of the BPL and AAY lists to eliminate bogus ration cards and to ensure coverage of only eligible BPL and Antyodaya families.

(ii) Ensuring leakages-free and diversion-free distribution of PDS commodities, regular inspection by different levels of functionaries, strict action against guilty persons/ agencies.

(iii) Involvement of Panchayati Raj Institutions in PDS operations - PRI representatives on Advisory Committees, running of fair price shops by Panchayats and effective representation of Panchayati Raj representatives on Vigilance Committees.

(iv) Ensuring transparency in working of PDS, display of BPL and AAY lists by fair price shops, observance of notified timings by fair price shops.

(v) Use of Information Technology, Computerization of TPDS operations, display of fair price shops-wise and district wise allocations of PDS commodities on web-sites for public scrutiny.

(vi) Carryout door-step delivery of PDS commodities to fair price shops.

(vii) Ensuring timely availability of and issuance of foodgrains by fair price shops.

(viii) Creating awareness among public about PDS operations, training Vigilance Committees of intricacies of PDS operations.

(ix) Making fair price shops financially viable entities — allowing them to sell non PDS items etc.

Statement-III

State/UT-wise status of Vigilance Committees formed by the respective States/UTs for monitoring the functioning of PDS

(Compiled up to 14-08-2007)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Constitution of Vigilance Committees at various level				Remarks
		State	District	Block	FPS/Village	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1 Meets once in a quarter	23 Meets Bi-monthly	304 Meets Bi-monthly	41,000 Meets Monthly	Instructions have been issued for reconstituting the Food Advisory Committee (FAC) in February, 2006 & July 2006, at District, Mandal and Village levels by involving the representatives of PRI. The Committee members has been assigned with certain tasks and vested with powers to inspect the FPS. They are made responsible for smooth functioning of PDS.
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	*	*	*	*	*Have been formed at State, District, Sub-divisional, block and circle level.
3.	Assam	No	Total District 27 - Committees formed: 17	Total Nos. of Sub-Division 29. Vigilance and monitoring committee constituted so 23 Nos.	Total GPSS and Lamps:- 761 FPS:-33, 30 Nos. 624 Nos. of Vigilance and Monitoring Committee so for constituted as GPSS & FPS level.	The newly constituted Vigilance & Monitoring Committees started their functioning and no report of dealing with complaints has so far been received.
4.	Bihar	No	38	534	8,471	The Committees are called 'monitoring committee'. In addition, 101 sub-division monitoring committees also formed.
5.	Chhattisgarh	1	16	146	9636	
6.	Delhi	1	*	* *	*	*Vigilance Committee have been set up in each circle (70)
7.	Goa	*	*	*	*	*The Village Panchayat & Municipal Admn. has been directed to constitute Village Committee at Village & Municipal Levels comprising of three

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
						members to heck and keep vigil on the functioning of the FPSs within their jurisdiction. Inspectorial staff has been posted in respective Talukas. Besides, Sarpanch, Opposition Member of panchayats have also been requested to monitor the PDS. The Director of Panchayat has been requested to send the names and address of the members of the vigilance Committees to give training on PDS.
8.	Gujarat	1	3	68	14,555	
9.	Haryana	Nil	Nil	Nil	7559	
10.	Himachal Pradesh	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
11.	J&K	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	These Committee meet regularly to take stock of the position and make remedial measures, wherever necessary.
12.	Jharkhand	—	—	—	—	No vigilance committee is functioning at present.
13.	Karnataka	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
14.	Kerala	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
15.	Madhya Pradesh	*	48	313	20178	*Not reported
16.	Maha-rashtra	Not Reported	23	214	22,736	In addition, 96 & 15 committees are there at Municipality and Municipal Corporation Level respectively.
17.	Manipur	Not Reported	Not Reported	Not Reported	Yes	
18.	Meghalaya	1	7	nil	4284	
19.	Mizoram	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
20.	Nagaland	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Reported	
21.	Orissa	—	30	311	1587	
22.	Punjab	*	19	130	8797	*Is under active consideration
23.	Rajasthan	1	32	241	21,607	
24.	Sikkim	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	
25.	Tamil Nadu	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	These are Advisory Committees and are functioning. These Committees are frequently meeting and the recommendations and suggestions of the Committees are received in Government for taking policy decisions to strengthen and streamline PDS.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	Tripura	*	*	*	Yes	*No Committee has been formed at these levels. Vigilance Committee are empowered to make statutory inspections of the FPS. Review meetings are arranged periodically.
27.	Uttaranchal					At present, the State Govt. has not constituted the Vigilance Committee
28.	Uttar Pradesh	No	70	820	52,002	
29.	West Bengal	1	19	341	18,053	
30.	A & N Islands	Nil	2	4	19	
31.	Chandigarh	8	6	Nil	54	Nil at Block level as Chandigarh is a single block. The ward/village level vigilance committees have been enrusted the work of monitoring the functioning the FPSs and to check whether, the guidelines of the GoI for TPDS are being compiled with, They interact with the cardholders also so as to ascertain whether, the FPSs are distributing the Essential commodities at correct rate and weight as specified by the GoI. So far no complaint has been reported by any Ward/Village level Committee.
32.	D & N Haveli	Being the UT small, only a district level committee is there.				Not reported
33.	Daman & Diu	Not reported				
34.	Lakshad-weep	There is one vigilance-cum-advisory Committee in each island in PDS. Besides this, a statutory vigilance committee is also there.				
35.	Pondi-cherry	There are State and Zonal vigilance committees				